



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ARE COLLEGE ENTRANCE REQUIREMENTS EXCESSIVE? ¹

WILSON FARRAND
Newark Academy, Newark, N. J.

The subject of this afternoon is assigned by your Executive Committee, not chosen by me. It consists of two question: the first, Are college requirements excessive? the second, What specific changes are desirable? From the fact that the second question is asked, it is safe to assume that I am expected to answer the first in the affirmative. Some time ago before another audience I answered the question, I think, without ambiguity. Now, after two years more of careful thought and study, after extensive correspondence and after much public discussion and private conversation, I have simply to reiterate my former answer, and to affirm unhesitatingly and emphatically that college entrance requirements are excessive in quantity.

What do we mean by excessive? Too great for what? We mean too great for the schools to accomplish properly, **with the emphasis on the word "properly."** My position is simply that in giving the quantity that is required of us we are sacrificing quality, that we are not sending into college boys and girls as well prepared as we are capable of preparing them, and that if the quantity of requirements were reduced we could and would send to college students better fitted to do college work, and who would, therefore, be more satisfactory to the colleges and to college teachers.

I am not just now concerned with the physical strain upon our students. It exists, more strongly with our girls than with our boys, and it is a factor not to be ignored in the problem, but personally I believe that the physical strain is due more to improper social life and home conditions, and to school organizations and athletics, than to over-study. My contention is that the amount of work we can secure from our boys and girls is spread over too large an area to secure the best results. We need less diffusion and more concentration.

¹ Read before the New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools, Boston, October 11, 1907.

The simple condition that confronts us now is that of a school course of approximately twelve years, followed by a college course of four years. The only question before us is whether the requirements for admission to college are too great to be accomplished properly in the present school course. If they are, the inevitable result must be a sacrifice of quality. That is the whole point of our contention. We are not looking for an easy task. We are seeking the chance to do an honest job. If we are forced to cover too much ground in those twelve years we cannot help scamping our work somewhere.

There has been a steady increase in the quantity of requirements going on for many years. One day last winter I ran over the Harvard catalogues for sixty consecutive years. It was one of the most interesting and edifying afternoons that I have ever spent. There was not a decade in which the requirements were not steadily and materially increased, and what is true of Harvard in this respect is true of nearly every other college in the country. Perhaps a concrete illustration will make the point clearer.

In 1802, barely a hundred years ago, the first mathematical requirement in America was established by Harvard. It consisted of arithmetic to the rule of 3, and apparently included no fractions. In 1816 it was enlarged to cover the whole arithmetic. In 1819 a small amount of algebra was added, and in 1825 this was extended to the end of simple equations. In 1843 for the first time an "introduction to geometry" was required.

At Yale, algebra to quadratics first appears as a requirement in the catalogue of 1845-46. In 1857 the first geometry was required—two books of Euclid. Later, three books of Legendre or Loomis were allowed as an equivalent of the Euclid. In 1885, four books of geometry were called for, and in 1887 this was extended to cover the whole of plane geometry. Since that time the requirement in algebra has been increased by the addition of a number of topics, and geometry has been enlarged by the insertion in standard textbooks of fully 50 per cent. more propositions, as well as by calling for the power to solve "originals" in an examination. Harvard has limited the number of book propositions by means of a syllabus, but so far, I believe, no other colleges have followed her example.

This sketch of the history of mathematical requirements illustrates what has been going on for more than a century. Not only have the requirements in individual subjects been increased, but new

subjects have been added every few years. At Harvard, ancient history was added in 1847, a modern language in 1875, and a science in 1876. At Yale, Greek history was added in 1874, Roman history in 1880, and a modern language in 1885. A careful estimate indicates that in forty years the Yale requirements have practically doubled in quantity, and what is true of Yale is true of most colleges.

Now this increase in the demands made upon the schools, to a point that is, I believe, beyond their capacity to meet properly, can produce only one result, and that is a distinct falling off in the quality of the work done. The weakness of modern American education is its superficiality. Our Rhodes scholars have proved themselves to be alert, bright young men, superior in general information to those with whom they come in competition, but distinctly behind them in exact and thorough scholarship. Business men are complaining today as never before of the difficulty of finding assistants trained to accuracy and exactness. American labor has ceased to lead the world in efficiency. Our colleges no longer give training. With their freedom of election, and their multiplication of "culture courses," they give broad outlooks on life, they bring the student into acquaintance with his complex environment; but they do not *train* him as they might, they do not develop in him that efficiency that counts for so much in life. Our technical schools do train, and in that respect they have taken the place occupied by the colleges years ago. The recognition of that fact by practical men is one of the reasons for the marvelous growth of these institutions of late years.

Now, I am not here to declaim against the degeneracy of modern times. I am not arguing that the old narrow training of the fathers was better than the broad, liberal culture of the sons. I am not trying to turn back the hands of the clock, nor am I undertaking the task of reforming our colleges. I am simply urging the fact that the period of secondary education is pre-eminently the period of training, and that our students who are preparing for college are not getting the training that they might receive, because, to meet the demands of the colleges, they are compelled to study too many subjects at once and to cover too much ground in the time at their command.

What I have been trying to do thus far in this paper has been to make clear the situation and my position, rather than to prove the contention. I have previously argued the question in detail, and it

has been discussed so fully in the last two years that we have probably all formed an opinion on the subject. At least, the facts on which to base an opinion are clearly before us. What is needed now is not so much argument as a clear statement of what may be done to remedy the existing situation.

We find, then, three specific grounds of complaint. The first is the constant tendency to increase the requirements. What has been going on for years still continues. Each committee of ten or fifteen strives to exalt its own subject, and adds something to the previous demands. Such a leader as President Eliot urges the unloading of more and more work upon the schools. In the second place, some of the leading colleges, Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Bryn Mawr, and a few others, demand too many subjects, and call for too much ground to be covered thoroughly in the ordinary school course. Harvard and Bryn Mawr are the worst offenders in this respect, for their requirements are greater in quantity than those of the other colleges. In the third place, the standard requirements—those of the College Board and of most colleges—in a number of subjects are too great in extent.

What can be done to meet these specific complaints, and to remedy existing conditions? I believe that the thing to do is to face the situation squarely, to grapple with it manfully, and to act, calmly and deliberately, but fearlessly. In the first place, let us rouse and express a public sentiment that will effectually check this constant tendency to increase requirements. Many of the additions to the requirements of individual colleges have been made simply because of a failure to realize the actual conditions under which we are working. The colleges are more anxious to secure well-prepared students than the schools are to supply them. Let us make it clear to them that the way to raise standards is not to call for greater quantity, but to insist on better quality. The Conference on Uniform Entrance Requirements in English meets in February. You are asked at this meeting to appoint delegates to a conference on the requirement in physics. The Modern Language Association will probably soon make some slight changes in the standard requirements in French and German, and from time to time the requirements in other subjects will no doubt be modified. Those who discharge these important tasks are usually able men and women honestly seeking what is best, but they are also usually specialists impressed with the importance of their own subject. Let us make clear to

them the situation, and urge upon them the truth that the all-round training and development of the boy and the girl is the matter of supreme moment, and that to demand more in any subject than can properly be performed is not an advance, but is a distinct lowering of the standard. If we accomplish nothing more than to call a halt for the next few years in this constant advance, and thus give the schools a chance to catch up and to learn how to do well the work now allotted to them, we shall have won a notable victory. Our work is going to improve in the future as it has in the past, but we urge that what we saved by improved methods and better teaching shall go to increasing our own efficiency, and not to relieving the colleges of more of their Freshman work.

The second specific recommendation that I make is radical. I propose that those colleges which require more than the normal amount—Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Bryn Mawr, and perhaps a few others—deliberately reduce the number of subjects called for. Such action would require courage, for it would look like a step backward, but it need be in no sense a lowering of standard. The protection against that is in the hands of the colleges, for those mentioned admit students only on examination, and can fix their own standards. They can make their examinations as hard as they choose, or, whatever criticisms have been made of the College Entrance Examination Board, no one, so far as I know, has yet suggested that its papers were too easy, or its markings too lenient. If examinations are not an adequate test by themselves, they can easily be supplemented, as I believe they should be, by certificates showing the amount and quality of the work done in school. By such a double test it would be possible to secure protection against inadequately prepared students. My point is simply that six subjects well mastered are better preparation for college work than seven or eight superficially covered. Twenty-two points of work well done ought to suit Harvard better than twenty-six less well done.

The result can be achieved in several ways. At a college like Harvard, where the point system prevails, a readjustment of values can be made that will be of decided benefit. For instance, the proposal has been made that the values assigned to the modern languages should be increased. It is difficult to see why elementary German should count only two points, while elementary Greek

counts four. At a college like Yale a system of alternatives for admission would afford some relief.

The second method would be for Harvard deliberately to reduce the total number of points required, and for Yale to cut off one entire subject, or parts of several subjects. This seems more drastic, and yet it is not without precedent. A few years ago Yale removed Ovid from its Latin requirement, a distinct reduction in quantity, and within a year the Cornell Engineering School similarly eliminated spherical trigonometry, a subject that never had any business in a school course. These are good examples to follow, and for similar action I venture to suggest Sallust, which Princeton alone, I believe, of all the colleges in the country requires, and analytical geometry, which Wesleyan seems to think within the scope of sub-freshmen.

Still another method of revising the requirements of those colleges which demand most, is by concerted action on their part. As a preliminary step to this, an authoritative estimate of the quantity of their requirements would be of great assistance, and would of itself throw light on the problem. Up to the present time there has been no generally recognized scale of measurement, and it has been largely a matter of individual opinion as to just how the requirements of one college compared with those of another. Recently, however, the Carnegie Foundation has attempted the task of reducing college requirements to a common denominator, and of measuring them in common terms. By co-operation of other organizations with the Carnegie Foundation it should be possible to measure college requirements in terms of school work, accurately and authoritatively. Such a measurement would be in itself illuminating, and would be of great assistance. With or without it, however, if either those colleges whose requirements are above a certain quantity, or those colleges with more than a certain number of students, or all of the colleges in a certain region, say New England, were to come together for conference, and were to discuss this question fully and candidly in all its bearings, it ought to be possible for them to reach some solid ground on which to base united action that would be less liable to misunderstanding and that would involve less embarrassment than individual action.

These suggested plans apply to particular institutions, and call for action on the part of individual colleges. There is a third method which can, perhaps, be applied more easily, and which will be of

great advantage because it applies to practically all colleges. That is to modify the standard requirements in different subjects. The tendency at the present time is to prepare these by united action, and they are usually now formulated by joint conferences of college and school representatives. As these committees meet from time to time, it is possible through them to bring about modifications that commend themselves to the school and college world.

I shall venture to suggest certain definite changes that would relieve the existing situation, and that I believe are desirable. They are not radical; they simply remove certain excrescences. I put them forward as the expression of individual opinion, and to afford a definite basis for discussion. If they win approval, each one of them is possible of attainment, and if they are attained I believe that they will mark a distinct advance in secondary education.

My first recommendation is that elementary algebra should end with quadratics, and that the topics beyond that should be relegated to freshman work or to the domain of advanced algebra. Some colleges have never added these topics to their requirement, but the recommendation of the American Mathematical Association includes the binomial theorem, and arithmetical and geometrical progressions, and this recommendation is adopted by the College Board, and by a number of individual institutions. Princeton adds to these permutations and combinations, and logarithms, and some other colleges make similar individual demands. These additions are of comparatively late date, and the increase in the algebra requirement in the last ten or fifteen years has been greater even than appears in college catalogues, for modern textbooks and recent examinations have distinctly increased the work to be done, even inside the old limits. I am told by college instructors that entering students are weak in two respects—accuracy of calculation, and thorough understanding of underlying principles. I accept that criticism as just, because it corresponds with my own observation. Accuracy of calculation can be attained only by extensive practice and drill. Understanding by immature minds demands time, and it is impossible to secure it when a class is forced to move at a hurried pace. A knowledge of some of these added topics is of little or no value for advanced work—if it is, it can easily be secured in college—but accuracy and thorough understanding are of vital importance. These we are to a considerable degree sacrificing, because we are trying to cover too much ground in a given time.

My second recommendation is that in geometry a syllabus of the essential propositions shall be adopted, that "book work" shall be limited to these, and that original work shall be restricted to propositions and problems based upon them. That is precisely what Harvard is doing, and what should be done generally. It was only twenty years ago that the geometry requirement at Yale was extended to cover the whole of plane geometry. At that time Davies' Legendre was probably the standard textbook. It contained 109 propositions. Three of the textbooks most widely used at the present time contain 167, 168, and 174 respectively—an increase of slightly more than 50 per cent. Nearly all of these additional propositions are of the nature of what might be called geometrical curiosities, interesting exercises but of no real value in the development of the subject. The Harvard syllabus contains less than 100 propositions, and yet this is supposed to include all that is essential. A mathematical colleague of mine figured up last summer that in the textbook in plane and solid geometry used in our school there were 775 different ideas to be appropriated by the students. By an idea he meant an axiom, a postulate, a theorem, or a corollary, that a pupil might be called on to use in a demonstration. Eight hundred ideas in one subject is a large number to grasp and to hold in mind ready for use. He urged that if the number were limited to five or six hundred, and the pupils gave the time and energy now spent in covering the additional two or three hundred to applying the smaller number in original work, they would develop more power and be better fitted for advanced work than they are at present. I think that the point is well taken. What I urge, then, in regard to geometry is the following of Harvard's example. The way is open, for one of our mathematical associations has prepared a similar syllabus.

My third recommendation is a reduction of the mathematical work demanded in physics. Physics used to be a delightful subject, and a joy to the students, but a large part of the joy seems to have fled. I admit that physics demands mathematics, and that a thorough knowledge of the subject is impossible without some mathematical work. I admit that the solving of problems in physics is one of the best applications of mathematics that we have, and that it is capital training. My point is that it has been carried too far, and that we are having too much of a good thing. The situation is something like that in geometry. It is not the use of a limited number of well-mastered ideas in new applications. There are so many different

kinds of problems, so many different facts and formulas to be carried in mind ready for use, that the mental energy is not employed in the best way and the mind itself has a tendency to become confused. Modern physics seems to be planned with a view to the development of physicists rather than to meeting the educational needs of the ordinary boy or girl. Just what reduction should be made I do not venture to say. That is a matter for those who know more of the subject, but that some reduction should be made is, in my judgment, unquestioned.

My fourth recommendation is that Latin and Greek composition shall be either eliminated or decidedly reduced. Composition is of unquestioned value in the mastery of a language, and I do not see how anyone can teach elementary Latin or Greek without its constant use, but when it comes to training, or trying to train, our pupils to write Latin like Cicero, or Greek in the style of Xenophon, my observation is that the results do not pay for the labor. I am aware that to many of you this view will appear heretical, and I do not propose at this time to argue it. I merely assert, as a thesis for discussion, that Latin and Greek composition in college-entrance requirements should be limited to exercises designed to illustrate commonly used grammatical principles.

My fifth recommendation is that in the English requirement there shall be a reduction in the emphasis placed on knowledge of specific books. Here again Harvard comes nearer than some others to the correct idea, in laying stress on the ability to write, and subordinating detailed knowledge of the contents of the books. The uniform entrance requirements in English have done a great deal to systematize English teaching in our schools, and to introduce the study of literature in many places where it did not formerly exist. I believe that the English of students entering college is better than it used to be, and is better largely because of this requirement. But it is equally true that it has distinctly increased the load laid upon our students. This requirement has now been tested long enough in actual practice for us to judge of the results with some accuracy, and, unless I am greatly mistaken, the opinion of the teachers of the country is turning in the direction that I have indicated. The last report of the English Conference, with the new requirement for the years 1909, 1910, and 1911 was a distinct step in that direction, and whatever future changes are made in the requirement, I believe, should be toward the same point of the compass.

My sixth suggestion, and the last that I shall make today, is that the field in ancient history shall be reduced to reasonable limits. Originally, I presume, the primary purpose of the requirement in ancient history was to illuminate and vivify classical study, and it was limited to what we know as the classical period, covering the history of Greece and Rome down, say, to the death of Augustus. A few years ago the Committee of Seven of the American Historical Association, desiring to provide for the study of the history of the world in four consecutive years, extended the period to include on the one hand the history of the Eastern nations, and on the other the history of Europe down through the time of Charlemagne. It is something of a shock to the old-fashioned mind to find that the study of ancient history must include the rise of Mohammedanism, the discussions on the Nicene Creed, and the career of Charles the Great. The plight of the teacher who tries to carry a class over this field in the time that can ordinarily be allotted to the study can easily be imagined. It is a clear case of sacrificing the student to the claims of historical theory. In a recent discussion on this subject, one member of the Committee of Seven said that the enlarged field could be covered in the same time as the old, simply by the omission of unimportant details. This, however, means generalization from a small basis of facts, and this, especially with the adolescent mind, means superficiality. Another member of the committee, in the course of the same discussion, said that this requirement was not put forth as something hard and fast by which we were to be bound, but as a suggestion, an ideal toward which we are to strive. That is the trouble with several of our college requirements. They are put out by specialists as ideals, and the poor pupils and we teachers strain our nerves to attain these ideals, with the usual result that comes from undertaking tasks too great for one's powers—incomplete attainment and superficiality. There are good reasons in favor of requiring a knowledge of ancient history of every student who enters college, but the results will be better, both in the development of the pupil, and in the laying of a foundation for future study, if the ground to be covered is confined within moderate limits.

I have this afternoon purposely devoted myself to assertion rather than to demonstration. My purpose has not been to prove, but to make clear my position, and to set forth certain definite proposals for consideration, for discussion, and for future action. The position is that the proposed reduction of quantity is primarily for the purpose

of improving quality. The proposals are three in number. The first is to check the existing tendency to increase requirements, by the creation and expression of a strong public sentiment. The second is for the half-dozen colleges that require more than the others deliberately to retrace their steps, and to cut down the quantity, an action that must come from the institutions themselves. The third is to reduce slightly the quantity required in each of several subjects, a step that can be accomplished mainly through the representative committees that meet from time to time. An extensive correspondence following the publication of a paper on this subject two years ago convinces me that the position which I here maintain is very widely held. The pressure is unevenly felt. It is felt least heavily, of course, in those schools which prepare chiefly for one college, or mainly for those colleges where the requirements are lowest, or where students are admitted on certificate. It is most heavily felt in those schools which prepare for a number of different colleges, and those in which preparation for college is not the main work. But if unevenly felt, it is widely felt. And the sentiment is not confined to the schools. I have in my possession a most interesting series of letters from college officers and professors squarely indorsing this position because of the unsatisfactory results as they see them. There is a wide-spread feeling that college entrance requirements are too great in quantity, and I believe that the time has come when this sentiment can be crystalized into action.

The discussion of this paper is reported in part as follows:

PROFESSOR J. G. HART, of Harvard University: Mr. Far-
rand thinks that college requirements are excessive in quantity. Our experience at Harvard does not bear out that contention. Take, for example, the entering class this year. Out of some 600 men admitted, more than 200, more than one-third, have been admitted to college on records which include a larger body of work than the college requires, in some cases a much larger body of work, and nearly one-half of those who tried the Harvard examinations this year offered themselves for examination on more subjects than the college requires. I know there are reasons for discounting that a good deal. There is a great deal of gambling with the examinations. Boys take them as a kind of insurance against conditions. They take them with the hope that they will thereby be enabled to shorten their period of residence in college, and they take them often with very insufficient preparation. But, making allowances for everything, it seems to me that if so large a propor-

tion of boys coming to a college which asks for more than any other college, does more than the required amount of work, the college is not asking more than a boy can do. These boys that I mention are not confined to any one part of the country, or to any one kind of school; they represent some seventy-nine different schools that are pretty well scattered over the country. The majority of those schools are public high schools, three of them I believe in Mr. Farrand's own state. It seems to me, therefore, that our experience would not warrant us in reducing the amount of work which a boy is expected to do.

On one of Mr. Farrand's other points I should differ with him. He contends that if the colleges asked for less they would get work of better quality. It seems to me that that is rather unlikely. If the best boys, the most industrious, can do more than the college asks for, are the average boys to change their natures and do work of better quality by being required to do less? It seems to me that is rather contrary to experience. In every discussion of this subject that I have ever heard it has been admitted by teachers that one of the chief difficulties that they have to contend with in covering the ground that the college requires is the pressure of outside interests. Are those interests going to be less strong, less attractive? It seems to me more likely that if you require the boys to do less in school they will simply use their extra time in attending to those outside interests. I cannot believe that simply by asking for less we shall really get more.

And yet I think that Mr. Farrand is on the right track when he contends for something that will improve the quality of work. I don't feel much hope, however, that the present condition of affairs will be improved by changing our ratings. I am quite ready to admit that the rating for Greek is as indefensible as anything in the protective tariff, and for the same reasons (laughter); but I have not much hope that any tinkering with the ratings, any changes of that kind in our extremely artificial system of measuring a boy's ability for college, is going to lead us into a better condition of affairs. It seems to me quite as likely to lead us into evils we know not of now as to take us out of those that we suffer from. The trouble, it seems to me, is not that we have unequal or unjust ratings, but that we have any ratings at all. With our characteristically American and misplaced faith in machinery, we have devised a very elaborate system of measuring a boy's ability for taking up college work. We

say that a boy must have so much algebra, and so much German, and so much French, and so much history, and so much physics, and so on, and if he produces evidence that he has the prescribed quantities of these subjects we add them together and say that the result is a boy ready to enter college. That may have been a good method in a time when a boy continued in college the subjects that he studied in the secondary school, and it is all right now, perhaps, so far as those departments are concerned where work is preceded by entrance examinations; but it seems to me that we are in an entirely different situation and need an entirely different kind of test for admission to college. If this quantitative way—if I may use that term—of measuring a boy's ability to enter college is right, it ought to correspond to the facts. According to my experience it does not correspond to the facts. Nothing is more common than for a boy, according to our way of measuring his ability when entering college, to stand the test successfully and then show that he is not fit for college at all, and nothing is more common than for a boy to take the tests that determine whether he has these quantities of knowledge, make a miserable showing, and then, after getting into college in some back-handed way, show that he was more fit for admission than a boy who stood the test more successfully. Every year boys come to Harvard from some out-of-the-way place, make a miserable mess of the entrance examinations, and yet when the Committee on Admission gets their school records, and information about them from their teachers, they find that it is reasonable to assume that those boys are ready to do college work and should be given a chance. In the majority of cases those boys prove that the committee is right. It seems to me, therefore, that the trouble is that we are applying the wrong kind of test for admission to college, that we should not use a quantitative method of determining whether a boy should enter college or not, but that we should use a qualitative method. Our experience shows that it does not matter very much what a boy knows, but it does matter a great deal what a boy is. It does not matter whether he has this subject or that subject, but it does matter a great deal whether he has the maturity of mind and general ability to take hold of college work and do it.

What we want is a system which will test a boy's ability and find out whether he really is prepared to do college work. I am not prepared to make any definite suggestions as to what such a system should be. The Harvard Committee on Admission has been

studying this matter for two years, and it is not at all clear as to how to go about it; but it has tried wherever possible to shift the influence of the college from emphasis upon quantity to emphasis upon quality. I think that the way out of such difficulties as Mr. Farrand has described is not through tinkering with our present system, but by changing it pretty radically, by devising some method by which we shall determine whether a boy is the kind of boy that can do college work, irrespective of how much knowledge he has in different subjects, and by using our tests in regard to quantity of knowledge in different subjects to determine what he should do in college.

I perhaps should not have tried to lead the discussion off the subject appointed for this meeting, but I have no interest whatever in matters of quantity; my only interest is in finding some way to manage this difficult subject of college-entrance requirements, so that we shall be able to determine whether or not a boy is fit to enter upon college work, whether he knows so much algebra, or so much Latin, or not.

DR. TETLOW: Mr. Chairman, I was a good deal surprised, in listening to Professor Hart, because he appeared to me not to be disposed to treat this subject seriously. For my part I was strongly impressed by what Mr. Farrand said. He gave us the history of the increased requirements, showed in detail how unsound they were, explained how quantity at the expense of quality resulted in superficiality, and made definite proposals for reform. Such presentation, it seems to me, deserves to be treated seriously. As I listened to Professor Hart, and heard him say that a great many students who came to college passed a wretched examination, that the college authorities afterward inquired of their teachers what their characteristics were, and what they were capable of doing, and gave them a chance to do college work on the strength of what their teachers said, I supposed the very next thing he would say would be that the proper method of admitting students to college was by certificate (applause). That was the goal toward which he seemed to be drifting; but he did stop short of that. I did not detect anywhere a disposition to receive otherwise than in a spirit of banter and pleasantry what had been presented so thoughtfully, and with such a basis of history, argument, and experience, I could not help feeling, while Mr. Farrand was speaking, that he was speaking out of the wealth of his experience. I have had two score

years of the same sort of experience, and I am ready to indorse substantially everything that he said. I hope that the specific recommendations he has made will be voted upon, and that we shall in this way revive in this Association the practice which prevailed in it at the very beginning, the practice, I mean, of doing something and not simply debating.

PROFESSOR HART: Mr. President: Mr. Tetlow has so completely misunderstood me that I hesitate to make another attempt to explain matters, for fear that I should simply obscure my meaning more. My sympathy is entirely with the schools. I think they are working under very hard conditions. Mr. Farrand has not in the least exaggerated the hard conditions under which they work, and college entrance requirements may be very largely responsible for those conditions; but I don't think the remedy is in the direction Mr. Farrand pointed out. That was all that I meant to say. It seems to me that we shall not improve things by reducing the amount of work that must be done, but that we must look for an improvement by trying to devise a system which will take emphasis off of mere amount of work and put it upon the quality of work.

DR. TETLOW: I labor under a personal infirmity. When I feel strongly I am likely to express myself impulsively, and I hope, if I erred in that direction, that Professor Hart will pardon me. But I feel that what was presented by Mr. Farrand is worthy of very serious consideration. Take, for example, a single illustration, the matter of ancient history. The requirement in ancient history used to extend in Greek history to the death of Alexander and in Roman history to the death of Commodus. With that limitation as to scope it was possible to teach history as history ought to be taught. But the moment that the limit was extended to 800 A. D., to the time of Charlemagne, then it became utterly impossible, within reasonable limits as to time, to teach history as it should be taught. What was my way of getting around the new requirement? It was to carry my class to a reasonable point, the point that had formerly been accepted as the limit, and then to say to the few individuals who were going to the colleges that had adopted the recommendation of the Committee of Seven, "If you will take such a book, naming a book that treated the period worthily, and read it three times through thoughtfully, taking notes as you read, and then come to me with a written abstract of what you have read, I will certificate you in ancient history." That was the only way by which I could retain

a sound method of teaching history. The experts in history had made it impossible for me to do anything else.

I don't suppose that we are ready to take a vote on the six recommendations that Mr. Farrand has made. Doubtless there would be a disagreement in matters of detail. But I think I can put a general motion that will call out the sympathy of those who agree with Mr. Farrand substantially in what he has said, and I cannot see that there would be any objection to our taking a vote on some general statement such as I am about to propose. I move that it is the sense of this association that the requirements for admission to college would be improved by the adoption of modifications in the direction of the six recommendations made by Mr. Farrand.

THE PRESIDENT: You have heard the motion. President Seelye of Smith College.

PRESIDENT SEELYE, of Smith College: I second heartily the motion which has been made by Mr. Tetlow, and in seconding it, I wish to express my approval of the paper which was read by Mr. Farrand. As a member of two college faculties, I have seen during the past forty years the introduction of many additions to the requirements for admission. I should differ somewhat from President Fellows in tracing the genesis of these additions. In my observations, almost without exception they have come from the demands made by the different collegiate departments for representation in preparatory schools.

Fifty years ago there was great need of an increase in the requirements for admission in order to raise the standard of scholarship. We are indebted to Harvard University for taking the lead in that respect. We are no longer, however, in that position. I think, as has been stated here this afternoon, we have gone to the other extreme. It is a fact which can be proved even more fully than it has been in the paper presented, that the requirements for entrance to college have doubled in fifty years. The evil effects of the change are not felt simply in the poorer quality of the scholarship which has been offered to the colleges; the evil effects have been felt in postponing the entrance of men into active life. There is much to be said on the physical side of the question, which has been neglected, and which we have not time to touch, but it is evident that many economic and social conditions have been seriously

affected by these increased requirements for admission to our colleges.

As a college man, I am impressed by this testimony which comes from nearly all the best teachers of our preparatory schools, that the college requirements are now too great for them to meet properly. Harvard ought to acknowledge that testimony, I think, more fully than it has thus far in the presentation which has been made. We are indebted to Professor Hart for his admirable criticisms last year of the examination methods in Harvard University, and for the beneficial changes which have been effected by putting the examinations upon a more sensible basis. If Professor Hart with his acumen would give the same critical study to the quantity of work which is now demanded for admission to college, I am confident we should have a different result from that which he has given in his address.

Professor Hart emphasizes just as strongly as Mr. Farrand the need of a better quality, but I think he has made a mistake in separating quality so entirely from quantity. I do not see, Ladies and Gentlemen, how we can improve the quality without regarding very closely the quantity of the work demanded. I think it is of the utmost importance that we consider the question of quantity first, and see whether this testimony which has been given to us from teachers whom we honor and trust, is not testimony that the managers of our colleges ought to heed and to accept.

I like what Mr. Russell said in regard to the languages. It seems to me that in addition to Mr. Farrand's suggestions we might also well adopt the one which Mr. Russell has made: that only two languages, aside from English, should be required of a student for admission to a college course. Two foreign languages are generally enough for a girl or a boy to study before sixteen; and, in my judgment, the colleges have erred in adding a third language, as many of them have done, to their requirements.

I was impressed by the statement of some college scientific professors a few days ago in reference to the elementaries in physics and in chemistry. They said that so far as teaching science was concerned they felt the colleges had made a mistake in demanding these elementaries; and that better scientific work could be done without them.

I therefore favor this motion which has been made, and hope it will prevail.

MR. GEORGE L. FOX, of The University School, New Haven, Conn. :
Mr. Chairman: I want to take a good deal of time. I am on the other side, very strongly on the other side. I think that I will demolish the paper of today very readily. I would not like to take that time until others have had a chance to speak, but I must insist on time. I have been a teacher of a secondary school for thirty years, preparing for Yale for thirty years, and I know what Dr. Farrand has said time and again, and he knows what I think of it. I am going to state here what I have stated to him, and then to my friend Tetlow in my amazement at finding him marching with the reactionaries, I must say, *Et tu Brute*.

I ought to begin with a few brief personal remarks, like another speaker. If I say hard things today, just remember that I am the mildest mannered man that ever scuttled ship or cut a throat. The two men who have championed this lowering of the standard of American scholars are men whom I like personally. I have always looked upon Mr. Tetlow as the grand old man of the secondary-school system of New England, and he deserves the appellation, but now I am amazed to hear him talk. He alluded to two things that awakened a response in my heart. One was that when he felt strongly he spoke very strongly. That is my case exactly—my case exactly—and I shall strike right from the shoulder. The second is that he spoke of the wealth of experience of Mr. Farrand. I speak from the wealth of experience of thirty years, and in order to make my argument a little more impressive I will have to go into some personal details about my own life, which are not very pleasant to me to detail, but they demonstrate the fact, and I am going to contrast it with his life.

Mr. Farrand comes from one of the best equipped schools in the United States. He has a large patronage, and he has a fine set of boys. He has well-paid teachers. My experience as a teacher is this: For three years, and while I was in college, I was a private tutor in New Haven. I then established the classical course for the teaching of Greek in the New Haven High School, and stayed there for eight years. Then I went to the Hopkins Grammar School of New Haven, and was there from 1885 to 1901, sixteen years. I undertake to say there is not a man in this room who taught, who prepared boys for college, under as hard conditions as I did in that school for sixteen years. The number of pupils varied from 60 to 110. It had almost no endowment. I had but three assistants, and

sometimes two and a half or three and a half. We had to fit boys for Yale College and the Sheffield Scientific School, and oftentimes the senior class was made up of 75 per cent. new men. He has not had any such experience as that.

I have fitted boys for Yale for thirty years, and I lay down the general principle that in the main the requirements at Yale have been fair, and the examination papers have been fair. I don't mean to say but what every year there is an exception to that, but in the main they have been fair, and I wish to lay that down as the fundamental proposition.

The second proposition is with regard to what Mr. Farrand said. I wish to challenge almost everything that he said with regard to the difficulty of examinations. Of course he could not bring proof, and he only gives his own experience. I bring mine.

I forgot to tell you the third experience of my life as a teacher. In 1901 I started a private school of my own, The University School, of which I am the sole teacher, except with a few assistants at the end of the year, so I have to teach every subject for admission to Yale. I teach every subject mentioned here today, except physics. The boys that I have are generally what are called in popular parlance "lame ducks." It is not true; I have some excellent boys, but in the main they are boys who have not seemed to get on in their studies, and it is my business as a teacher to get hold of them and lift them up. In a large summer school I had this summer one of the boys showed me a postal card he had received, and it was directed to him at: "Fox's School for the Brainless." That was a very unjust libel upon my boys, but in the main I have boys who have not got on in other schools. So I think I might say that my conditions for teaching are far more difficult than those of my friend Farrand, and cover a longer period of time. He has had one difficulty which I have not had; he prepares for different institutions, as I understand. My sole aim has been Yale from the start. But I frankly say, from my knowledge of other colleges, etc., that if a boy will pass that stone wall of the college examination at Yale as it is now constituted or has been constituted for several years, he need not be afraid of going anywhere else. I know my boys this year who have been rejected by that examination committee have gone right off to other colleges, and they say to me, "We can get in *there* and get in *there*." So I say as to wealth of experience I challenge the right to speak as much as Mr. Farrand.

Now, then, all his historical part was wide of the mark. Of course we have improved in a great many things, and it is a good thing for us that we have improved. That does not make any difference.

He speaks of the increase of the requirements. So have they increased in the college course. They do not greatly increase. It is no argument, therefore, that we should go back because we have gone forward, not a bit. The true test is this: We have splendid boys and girls. We say they are the equal of any in the land. Well, then, what do they accomplish compared with the boys and girls of our three great rival nations, England, France, Germany? If I may be permitted a slang phrase in the midst of this audience of purists, they are not "in it" with the secondary-school boys and girls of England, and France, and Germany.

I know that. In the year 1890 I first began to visit the great English public schools, and every year I have been whenever I have been across the ocean, always at Rugby, and it is my pleasure at Rugby that sometimes my host, who is one of the masters, gets a few of his friends together, and I tell them what splendid work they do, and how much better they do it than American teachers do. The average English school boy gets through his school at nineteen, and he has covered practically all the requirements for admission to college in this country and most of the two years of college life, without any whining, and without any whining on the part of the teachers. I may say it, I suppose, in the way of scolding, but I don't like the spirit of my colleagues in this country as compared with that of the English secondary-school teachers. They are not always whining to the universities about this and that. They say to the universities, "What is the job you have for us? We will do it," and that is the way for us to act.

I say that the requirements for admission to college in this country are by no means excessive, and if there is any member of any college faculty within the hearing of my voice, this is my parting injunction to him, repeated and repeated and repeated, "Don't give way an inch, except in a few unimportant particulars." We have not got far enough. We are steadily gaining. The average American school boy, as I say in my own school circular, is a dawdler as compared with the secondary-school boys of other countries.

Now let me take up in particular some of his requirements and

some of his recommendations. Moreover, in the first place I am going to take up the part in which I agree with him, strange to say. Isn't it strange, I heartily support one of his motions, and supported it some time before he did? I happened to be a member of the Committee of Seven that has been referred to, well, rather uncomplimentarily, and the fight that he is making here today and the fight that Mr. Tetlow made I made in that committee. The only regret of my life is that I did not have a minority report. I said "Mediaeval history is of no value, comparatively, for the secondary schools, and extremely difficult to teach. It is a tangle of things, and the average boy or girl cannot penetrate it. Stop with Commodus." But they wanted to have a long elaborate thing from the Flood way down to the present time, and they got it. I yielded to persuasion and did not come out with a minority report upon that. But that change ought to go right ahead at once. It makes no difference to me. Yale has never followed that requirement. Yale does not go quite far enough. She doesn't go back to the Persians and the Egyptians, and she doesn't go far enough in Roman history. She stops with the reign of Augustus. I am very much interested in the Flavian emperors, and I wish that she would take those in and stop there. Mr. Farrand is perfectly right, and Mr. Tetlow is perfectly right, with regard to that recommendation in history; but that does not concern a large number of schools.

And now, having given the point where I agree with him, I am going to say where I disagree. In the first place, his talk about algebra arouses in my inner consciousness an overpowering sense of fatigue. Why, to stop with quadratics in algebra is ridiculous. I wish he would look at some of those English papers in algebra and books on algebra. The requirement in algebra to my mind is now too little. It takes in arithmetical progression and the binomial theorem, with only positive and integral exponents. As I have told him more than once, the colleges have gone back. They used to have fractional exponents and permutations and combinations. That is a material difference. "Why do you not go back to that? Why do you not stand up for that?" "Well, we had so much pressure from the schools we thought we would pull it out."

The Sheffield Scientific School has done great work recently in the line of algebra, and it is a line which is especially unpleasant to Mr. Farrand, with his allusion to "graphs." I am going to speak upon that a little more at length, to show the different spirit of

English secondary teachers and American teachers. Four or five years ago the Scientific School put out an additional requirement, called Algebra B. The additional requirement A now in the Scientific School covers practically what Yale College requires in A and B. It goes through to progressions. They have put on permutations and combinations, the binomial theorem, with fractional exponents, the graph, and the discussion of the theory of equations. At first there was a tremendous howl. They simply said, "We need this to do better work in our freshman year. We therefore must insist upon it." Now I think the schools have accommodated themselves to that pitch, and so far the mathematical education of men for technical schools has been benefited by that action of the Scientific School, and I praise them for it. The question of graphs came out in England only about ten years ago. It was earnestly recommended. Immediately everybody took it up. They have published textbooks—I suppose I have at home six or eight admirable ones—just on that subject, showing the practical application of the subject. The treatment of the subject in no modern algebra published in the United States compares with those little books published on that subject in England. So I ask every college president and professor here not to lessen the requirements in algebra in the slightest.

I say also this: that the present two years open for teaching the amount of algebra required is an abominable waste of time—is an abominable waste of time. Anybody, in my opinion, ought to cover that ground easily in a year and a half, and I expect to cover it this year with three boys, not very bright boys, in a year. If I were a dictator here in America I would allow only one year and a half in algebra, and devote the remaining six months to teaching civil government, making it a required study for admission to college.

The second thing that he spoke of was with regard to Greek and Latin prose composition. I am just as firmly opposed to that proposition as I am to the other. Greek and Latin prose composition is one of the best means possible for teaching the boy to think, for clearing the cobwebs out of his mind, for getting down through this crust of superficiality to some solid rock that is difficult to find in some of their minds, and we want the subject kept just where it is. The great trouble is superficiality, and no boy can take Greek and Latin prose composition successfully, in the same way with modern languages, unless he has got a pretty good knowledge of the lan-

guage. I always put it right on to a boy, and I am very much pleased to have boys who after a while say, "Well, this is fun." I say, "Of course it is fun, if you go to work at it; but if you seek the line of least resistance it is not fun." Therefore Greek and Latin composition ought to stay just where they are. The requirements are not difficult. I know the papers of the examination board, and I know the papers of Yale College. With my class this summer I put a boy through all the papers of the examination board, and he said, "They are pretty hard." I said, "No harder than you are likely to get."

In this country we have already emasculated the Latin and Greek composition course by this miserable principle that you must limit it to certain portions of authors read. Yale now under pressure has limited it to certain orations of Cicero. What did I see in Rugby with boys two or three years before going to college? Pieces from George Eliot given them to translate into Latin. That is the way they turn out scholars. Why is it that the Rhodes scholars, even graduates from colleges here, go to Oxford to find that a boy comes from the sixth at Eton, or Harrow, or Rugby at 19, and beats them out in his grammatical and classical attainments? It is because the English public school has said to the boy, "That is to be done. Do it." I am reminded of the reply of a barkeeper out in Leadville to the request of a tenderfoot coming into his saloon for a bottle of apollinaris. He reached for his revolver and pointed to him and said, "You don't want apollinaris, you want whiskey, and you will like it, too." We need much more of the Spartan spirit in our schoolrooms, and less of the sugar coated pill theory of education.

Now, these boys are altogether too much coddled, to use a phrase which has come into public prominence a good deal of late. In intellectual life and effort, judged by work done and examinations faced, the American school boy as compared with his brother of the same age in England, France, or Germany, is a "molly-coddle." I say that deliberately. I know personally the work of the English schools, I think, as well as any other man in this room, and I know something of the work of German schools, and I have a collection of fine textbooks which I bring home every year. A year ago it was mathematics, this year modern languages. I brought home the textbook on mathematics used at Rugby forms two or three years

before graduating and showed it to a friend of mine, a professor of mathematics. "Why," he said, "there is not a man ordinarily coming to college in this country that could stand that work."

That brings me to my next point and that is the recommendation of the syllabus in geometry. Oh, this feeding out milk to full-grown boys. There is not any geometry that I know of that contains too many propositions. I use one very little known in this part of the country, but to me an admirable one, and I find a good number of propositions in it that are not in the Harvard syllabus at all. Boys come to me and complain sometimes, "Why, that proposition is original." I say, "It does not make any difference. You are to get it." With these lame ducks of mine that I had last year I covered the whole of that book. I covered about 150 originals—and I am not naturally a good mathematical teacher—and I covered my syllabus, so to speak, of 100 in Geometry B, as it is called at Yale, viz., the application of geometrical principles to arithmetical computation. Nobody here but a Yale man I suppose would know what that means. It simply means the practical application of geometrical principles or figures. I had some boys this last summer who were always complaining of it, and they could not do my syllabus. I said, "You will do it, of course." When they got through they said, "That is first rate. It is just what we needed." Now, then, that syllabus business is something that nobody ought to put his name to. It is lowering the standard of American scholarship. It is lowering the standard of American attainment of secondary schools. I hope there will be enough in this room that will not agree that that is the sort of thing.

There has been a great improvement in geometrical teaching since I was a boy, tremendous, and I am glad of it. This year we had at Yale the hardest paper I think I have ever seen set in Yale College. It is the hard paper of this year. I am not going to protest much against that paper, because it has done a great deal of good. My boys are all interested in it. They said, "There are more originals than I ever saw before." Only three book propositions, but most of them did very well. The examiners said, "We don't expect that they may get the whole of that paper or half of that paper. We judge by the manner of their tackling original propositions, whether they have got the original habit of mind that they should have in geometry. We don't expect them to do all. We

sometimes pass a boy who has not got 50 per cent. of that paper, simply because he has shown that he is able to apply geometrical principles in the way we want them applied." It is simply the carrying out of that recommendation of the Mathematical Association in England, called practical geometry. You hardly know a book of that sort in this country except a few of the newer books, but you will find half a dozen of them published in England in the last two years.

I think I have hit everything—let me see, algebra, history, Latin and Greek composition, and what was this last point? syllabus. That syllabus in geometry, yes. I would like to hit that still harder. I believe the only other point is physics. Now, I have to say upon that very little. It does not concern me at all. It does not concern the large majority of boys preparing for college at all, unless they are preparing for Harvard, and I don't pretend to know as to the difficulty of requirements in physics. I have never taught physics, and so I don't know the subject. I don't prepare in it. But I say this with regard to any action proposed by Mr. Tetlow, that the question of physics is a comparatively unimportant one compared with the other questions. Indeed for any school that prepares for Yale it makes very little difference. It is not, therefore, a question of great consideration. But I will say this before you take action on that. I will have to drop again into a little personal talk now.

I had a boy who came to me a year ago from a certain famous school as a hopeless case. Well, he went on through the year, and he got off a good number of subjects for the Scientific School, much to my surprise. He was so satisfied with what he had done that he wanted to spend his summer at it, and when I got back from Europe he was on the ground and anxious for more, like *Oliver Twist* crying for more. I said, "You shall have it," and I put him through. To my utter amazement he has added five subjects now, and he has, I think, only five more, or four more, to add. When he found he had done so well he thought he would wait until Christmas and take a vacation. His family wanted him to stay with me. But he is unfortunately one of those boys who rule their destinies; they rule their families. That is one of the great troubles with your boys. I said to the father, "Now, I will take this boy, and I will give him some additional work in physics through one of my assistants," for this reason: Anybody who knows about the

massacre of—we won't say—the innocents in the Sheffield Scientific School will tell you that of the large number who are dropped during the freshman year a very large portion have been shipwrecked upon mathematical physics and analytical geometry. I will organize a small class for those and two or three boys who are going to the Scientific School, and we will take mathematical physics, so when they get into the Scientific School they won't find it so hard as otherwise they would. Mathematical physics has got to be done somewhere, either in the secondary school or in the freshman year of the technical school. If you will do it yourselves there will be a chance for the teacher in the school to build higher up. If you don't do it, it has got to be done outside. But I care very little about that requirement. It does not concern me.

Have I hit all your points now, sir? Is there any other point? I think not. I will not take your time any longer. I have spoken with great feeling on this subject. I shall close by a motion to amend Brother Tetlow's motion. I object to action on this subject at the present time for two reasons, first, because there has not been full notice of the possibility of such action—

DR. TETLOW: May I interrupt to ask a question?

MR. FOX: Yes, sir.

DR. TETLOW: Do you object, Mr. Fox, to our finding out what the members present think about it?

MR. FOX: Put it in detail. Don't have any omnibus bill, as this is. If you will have the history clause I will vote with you, but when you come to bring in a whole omnibus bill I cannot. Secondly, we want to have fuller notice given those in this association. The secondary schools are very, very largely represented, and it is not fair to the colleges, if they are to have a discussion of that matter, that they may not know it. I should move, then, that this resolution be laid on the table and be made the order of action for next year, and that full information be sent to all the colleges, and they be asked to memorialize the association as to their feelings with regard to the subject, as to the action. That is my amendment to that motion. If it is a good cause it won't lose by waiting. We need a full, frank discussion. I expected to memorialize all the faculties of New England that I thought were interested in it, influenced by the New York Schoolmasters' Association when they had this up last year, but I got the impression from somebody down there that they had seen a better light, were not going to push

the thing. But I don't think that your action on this matter ought to be precipitate. In the second place, a vote should not be taken until after full discussion. Third, it should not be taken until the colleges have had a fair chance to put their side. I have tried to put it a little today.

I thank you very much for listening to me. I thank you sir, for giving more time than I deserve, possibly, but I wanted very much, and there have been very few to speak upon this side. I have taken more time than possibly I ought to have taken. If you only knew how much more I wanted to say you would forgive me.

THE PRESIDENT: I think we ought to give Mr. Farrand a chance to say a few words before we close this discussion. Mr. Farrand.

MR. FARRAND: One or two things have come up this afternoon in regard to which I should be glad to say a word or two. I cannot touch Mr. Fox's point of view, because he speaks from a transcendental experience that is very different from that of most of us. He may remember that in my paper I said that the pressure was unevenly felt and was felt less in those schools that prepared for only one college. Possibly, if some of the rest of us were simply preparing boys for Yale College, and had some of those brilliant "lame ducks" that he seems to have, we could do the work; but the question is hardly to be argued on that basis. What he said of the English boys reminds me of something that I think I am violating no confidence in saying. During the last summer, President Eliot, in talking with a friend of mine from New York, spoke of the fact that the scholarship of our American boys was poorer than that of the English boys, and illustrated his point by saying that our Rhodes scholars found themselves inferior in accurate scholarship to the English students with whom they came in competition. My friend turned on him and said, "That is true, and do you know the reason why? In my judgment the main reason is that those English students have never been forced over half of the subjects that you require of every Freshman that goes into Harvard College." In that lies the very point of the contention that I am making.

Professor Hart spoke of a third of the candidates for admission to Harvard offering more than the required number of points. That statement disturbed me when Dean Sabine made it in New York last spring. I very quickly, however, found the loophole that

Mr. Russell discovered, and the more I have thought over the matter, the more clearly I have come to the conclusion that Harvard is being "buncoed." We have not all the facts before us, but it is an easy matter for boys to take "fliers" in subjects in which they are by no means prepared. There is another matter that it would be well for the Harvard Committee on Admissions to investigate. I know of very few high schools in which the course of study taken by an individual student contains more than is required for Harvard. I have been told by teachers preparing boys for Harvard that a considerable proportion of their students have to take an extra year. I do not know how large that proportion is, but I have had several cases in my own school of boys who have found the burden so great that it was necessary to add a year to their course. There was not a full year's work left and they were, therefore, able to do more than was required for admission. They were a year behind time, however, in entering. Such considerations as these make us feel that closer investigation is called for, and I doubt very much if we shall find, on careful investigation, that the schools of the country are able to do more than is required by Harvard today.

Professor Hart's main point, however, was that, while there is something wrong in the quality of the work submitted for entrance to college, the way to remedy it is not along the lines indicated. That may mean nothing, or it may mean a great deal. It may mean that Harvard is contemplating a movement toward the certificate system, or, what I should fancy would be more probable, toward a new method of determining fitness for admission; and it is possible that Harvard will evolve something that will solve this difficulty. But suppose that Harvard is hatching out something. Ought the whole educational world simply to sit still while Harvard incubates? We are confronted with a condition; we have work to do which is straining our powers and which we are not able to do well. The remedies that I have suggested deal with the conditions as they exist. Let us try these remedies unless someone comes forward with something that is better.

THE PRESIDENT: May I ask Dr. Tetlow whether he accepts the amendment that has been suggested?

DR. TETLOW: I do not consider a motion to lay a matter on the table to be an amendment. I suppose, however, that such a motion takes precedence of the original motion.

MR. FOX: I did not hear your last word. You did not consider it an amendment what?

DR. TETLOW: It is a choking off of the motion that I made, not an amendment of it.

MR. FOX: Well, I moved the motion in the most solemn manner.

DR. TETLOW: When a member moves in the form of an amendment something in fact is not an amendment—

MR. FOX: It seems to me that no separate action should be taken.

DR. TETLOW: What is proposed cannot be called an amendment; but, of course, in parliamentary practice it takes precedence of the original motion.

THE PRESIDENT: Certainly.

MR. KNOX: I suppose the vote to lay on the table must be taken first?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. The “so-called” amendment if I understand it, is a motion to lay upon the table the motion made by Dr. Tetlow.

MR. KNOX: It is not an amendment.

THE PRESIDENT: No, it is really a motion. I presume we shall have to vote on this first.

MR. FOX: I will supplement that with the motion that it be taken up next year for formal action of the association. Or must I make those as two motions? I am anxious for a decision of this matter as well as anybody but I want full and fair discussion of it; I want full representation of the colleges and everything of that sort.

THE PRESIDENT: If I may say so, I think that is all that Dr. Tetlow is seeking in this matter. He merely wishes a vote that it is the general sense of the meeting that changes or modifications in the college entrance requirements shall be made in the general direction indicated. It is surely not a very radical or far-reaching motion, or one that will arrest full discussion or action subsequently.

MR. FOX: May I speak again a moment?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, sir.

MR. FOX: My feeling in regard to that proposition is this: If this meeting represents this association upon such an important matter as that—

DR. TETLOW: Mr. Chairman, that motion is not debatable, I believe.

THE PRESIDENT: No, sir. You have heard Mr. Fox's motion, the so-called amendment. I suggest that we vote upon that first. It is moved and seconded that Dr. Tetlow's motion be tabled.

(Mr. Fox's motion was rejected.)

THE PRESIDENT: We can now put Dr. Tetlow's motion. If he will be kind enough to give it in exactly the words in which he gave it before, perhaps we shall vote more intelligently. Dr. Tetlow, will you be kind enough to state the motion again?

DR. TETLOW: I move that it is the sense of this association that the requirements for admission to college would be improved by the introduction of changes or modifications in the direction of the six recommendations made by Mr. Farrand.

THE PRESIDENT: The association has heard the motion, and it is seconded.

(The motion was adopted.)

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Fox is opposed.

MR. FOX: There were two negative votes.